

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed on August 5, 2009, claims 1-14, 16-19, 21, and 22 are rejected. In response, claims 1, 10, and 17 have been amended, claims 12, 13, and 22 have been canceled, and new claims 23-25 have been added. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments, the new claims, and the below-provided remarks.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16-18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Ito et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,944,768, hereinafter “Ito”). Additionally, claims 3, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ito in view of Nakano et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0128768A1, hereinafter “Nakano”). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over Ito and Nakano for the reasons provided below.

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“An arrangement for navigation to predetermined destinations within a search area, which is divided up by means of a linear system of coordinates into coordinate fields, wherein, by means of automatic positioning at predetermined time intervals, that coordinate field is determined in which the arrangement is situated, wherein the arrangement displays to a user, who has input one of the predetermined destinations into the arrangement, navigation information, wherein the navigation information includes:

a description of the current coordinate field; and  
a description of the next coordinate field for reaching the destination;  
wherein the navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database without having to calculate a route.” (emphasis added)

Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 1, lines 3-14 and page 6, lines 10-12. Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that “*the navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database without having to calculate a route*” (emphasis added), as recited in

amended claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Ito.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As shown in Fig. 29, Ito discloses a route search processing step (SA5), where an optimum route from a guidance start point to a final guidance point is determined through searching stored map information. (See also column 26, lines 25-42 of Ito).

Additionally, Ito discloses that the optimum route is a route that allows reaching of the destination in the shortest time or by the shortest distance or, if an express road is used, a route that allows reaching of the destination in the shortest time or by the shortest distance using the express road. (See column 26, lines 28-35 of Ito). Accordingly, to find the shortest time or shortest time, Ito must calculate the times or distances associated with each route and then compare the calculated times or distances to obtain the desired route. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that calculations are required by Ito to find the optimum route. In other words, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito discloses that a calculation is required to obtain a route. In contrast, the arrangement of claim 1 does not require a calculation to obtain a route. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that “*the navigation information is obtained directly from a data record in a database without having to calculate a route*” (emphasis added), as recited in amended claim 1. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Ito.

#### Dependent Claims 2-9

Claims 2-9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2-9 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1. Additionally, claims 5-7 and 9 are allowable for further reasons, as described below.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that “*the database is situated in a central memory/server, which the arrangement accesses by means of a radio*”

link” (emphasis added), as recited in claims 5-7 and 9. Ito discloses that a navigation system includes external information storage units such as CD-ROMs. (See column 4, lines 57-60 of Ito). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that the navigation system accesses external information storage units “by means of a radio link,” (emphasis added), as recited in claims 5-7 and 9. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that the above-identified limitation in claims 5-7 and 9. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 5-7 and 9 are not anticipated by Ito.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose that “*a user of the arrangement may record in the database personal destinations and enter him/herself in the data records descriptions for the current coordinate field and the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 9. Ito discloses that it is possible to provide guidance in accordance with a specific interest of a user. (See column 6, lines 1-6 of Ito). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito is silent on the limitation that “*a user of the arrangement may record in the database personal destinations and enter him/herself in the data records descriptions for the current coordinate field and the next coordinate field to be located in order to reach the destination*” (emphasis added) in claim 9. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Ito does not disclose the above-identified limitation in claim 9. As a result, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 9 is not anticipated by Ito.

#### Independent Claim 10

Claim 10 has been amended to remove the term “only” and to include the limitations of claim 13. Claim 13 has been canceled. As amended, claim 10 includes similar limitations to claim 5. Because of the similarities between claim 5 and amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 5 apply also to amended claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 10 is not anticipated by Ito.

#### Dependent Claims 11, 14, 16, and 21

Claims 11, 14, 16, and 21 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 11, 14, 16, and 21

are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10. Additionally, claim 16 includes similar limitations to claim 9. Because of the similarities between claim 9 and claim 16, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 9 apply also to amended claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 16 is not anticipated by Ito.

#### Independent Claim 17

Claim 17 has been amended to remove the phrase “characterized in that the database is situated locally in the arrangement” and to include the limitations in claim 22. As a result of the amendments to claim 17, claim 22 has been canceled. As amended, claim 17 includes similar limitations to claim 9. Because of the similarities between claim 9 and amended claim 17, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 9 apply also to amended claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 17 is not anticipated by Ito.

#### Dependent Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 18 and 19 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17.

#### New Claims 23-25

New claims 23-25 have been added. Support for claims 23-25 can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, original claims 1-9. Claim 23 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 10. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 23 is allowable at least based on an allowable claim 10. Claims 24 and 25 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 17. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 24 and 25 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 17. Additionally, claim 25 includes similar limitations to claim 5. Because of the similarities between claim 5 and claim 25, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above with regard to claim 5 apply also to claim 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 25 is not anticipated by Ito.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: October 1, 2009

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111